

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please replace the third drawing sheet, showing FIG. 3, with the attached amended drawing showing FIG. 3.

The view of FIG. 3 is amended to show the piping support structure 44 and coolant line guides 46 referenced in original claims 1 and 2, and shown in lesser detail in FIG. 1. FIG. 3 is also amended to show the flanged hole 48 mating with the coolant line guide enclosure flange 30 in FIG. 2. No new material is added by these amendments.

Attachments: One replacement sheet.

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending. FIG. 3 is replaced with an amended version. Claims 1, 3, 4, 21, and 24 are amended. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "...wherein said air conditioner is configured to establish an environmental regime within said cabinet compatible with operation of the coolant compressor/chiller over a range of outdoor environmental conditions." Claim 3 has been amended to correct dependency and to incorporate the terminology used in paragraph [0026] of the specification. Claim 4 has been amended for consistency with claim 3, from which it depends. Claims 21 and 24 have been amended for consistency with the specification. Support for the amendments is found in the specification. No new matter is added. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 6, 7, 9-11, and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-5, 8, 12, and 14-26 also contain patentable subject matter.

The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. All the pending claims at issue are believed to be patentable over the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

DRAWING OBJECTIONS

In the Office Action of May 19, 2005, the drawings are objected to, indicating that certain elements in the claims are not fully presented in the drawings. The amendment to the attached drawing page is believed fully responsive to the objection, in that the claimed piping support structure and coolant line guides are presented in sufficient detail in both FIGS. 1 and 3 to demonstrate the claim elements. The flanged hole 48, not the subject of an objection, is added to FIG. 3 for consistency with the specification and with the corresponding graphical elements in FIGS. 1 and 2. For clarity, the element terminology

from the original claim 2 and the reference numerals from the amended drawings are presented in an amended paragraph in the specification.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 8, 12 and 14-26 are Directed to Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 8, 12, 14-19, and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Lewis et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,333,460); and rejects claims 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Lewis in view of Linhardt (U.S. Patent No. 3,799,249). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, Applicant asserts that none of the applied art of record, individually or in combination, teaches or suggests an enclosure for containing at least one coolant compressor/chiller for a housed cryogenic apparatus that includes a cabinet coupled to the apparatus housing, wherein the cabinet is configured for deployment in outdoor environments, an air conditioner affixed to said cabinet, wherein the air conditioner is configured to establish an environmental regime within the cabinet compatible with operation of the coolant compressor/chiller over a range of outdoor environmental conditions, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 21 and 24.

Lewis provides a cold head 30 to which objects to be chilled are attached (col. 3, ll. 50-55), wherein the objects to be chilled are components of another system, housed in a cryostat and affixed to the cryocooler enclosure of Lewis (col. 4, ll. 18-32). Because the apparatus of Lewis is a cryocooler, configured within a chassis adequate to allow the cryocooler to be mounted in an enclosure, the apparatus of Lewis does not disclose an enclosure for providing a thermally regulated environment for at least one cryocooler device installed within the enclosure. Lewis instead teaches a self-contained, portable

cryocooler (col. 1, ll. 53-59) to be mounted within a “standard” EIA enclosure (col. 2, ll. 54-60).

Lewis does not teach or suggest providing, as a part of the cryocooler, a cabinet including an air conditioner configured to establish an environmental regime within the cabinet compatible with operation of at least one coolant compressor/chiller over a range of outdoor environmental conditions, as recited in Applicant’s claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 21 and 24.

To the contrary, heat from the cryocooler of Lewis is rejected to an air stream which flows in and out of the cryocooler of Lewis through a heat exchanger and grill, to a space wherein the EIA enclosure of Lewis is located (col. 4, ll. 7-13).

In contrast, Applicant’s independent claim 1 is directed to a cryogenic system having a cabinet coupled to an apparatus housing with an air conditioner configured to establish an environmental regime within the cabinet compatible with operation of the at least one coolant compressor/chiller over a range of outdoor environmental conditions. There is nothing within Lewis that teaches, suggests or remotely appreciates such a feature. In contravention to a statement in the Office Action of May 19, 2005 at page 3, paragraph 4, the cryocooler of Lewis does not contain an air conditioner. While Lewis does contain a cooling device for a cryogenic fluid, the output of the apparatus is heat flow at a cold head—a sealed, thermally conductive surface for removing heat from a solid object, external to the apparatus of Lewis, by conduction (col. 3, ll. 50-55).

Linhardt discloses a liquid natural gas (LNG) conversion for storage and use in a gaseous state. See, Abstract. Linhardt does not disclose or suggest an air conditioner configured to establish an environmental regime within the cabinet compatible with operation of the at least one coolant compressor/chiller over a range of outdoor environmental conditions, nor does the Office Action assert such. Linhardt thus does not supply the subject matter missing in Lewis.

Accordingly, Lewis and Lindhardt, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation recited in the independent claims. Thus, independent claims 1, 21 and 24 are directed to patentable subject matter. The dependent claims are directed to patentable subject matter by virtue of their dependency as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe anything further is necessary to place the application in a better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at 202-861-1706.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicant petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



B. Y. Mathis
Reg. No. 44,907

Date: 9/14/05
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1500
Facsimile: 202-861-1783